



Stupidity, Treason, or Irrationality?

By MR. ALFRED KOHLBERG
of New York

Address before Sunday Evening Club
FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Sunday Evening, February 24, 1954

Stupidity, Treason, or Irrationality?

FOUR YEARS AGO this spring, Dr. Fifield dropped into my office in New York immediately after he had had a talk with one of our elder statesmen. He told me that the statesman had told him that he was frequently being asked by visitors: "How did we get into this international mess we are in? Was it caused by stupidity or treason?"

Four years ago informed Americans realized what every American knows today: that our freedom is in peril and that the mistakes that have brought us to this peril may have been caused by stupidity and incompetence, or by deliberate treachery—or a combination of both.

Of course, stupidity played an important part in bringing us from unconditional victory to the brink of unconditional disaster in less than seven years. Seven years ago the Soviet Union was punch-drunk. Nearly half of European Russia was destroyed. 20,000,000 Russians were dead. We marshalled overwhelming forces. Previously, on January 1, 1942, the Soviet Union had signed the Atlantic Charter pledging itself "not to seek any aggrandizement, territorial or other," and to extend the right of self-determination to all people.

Thus we had both the written promise and the physical power to bring about the peace we wanted. But the two Presidents and five Secretaries of State who have controlled our fate, and have been responsible for our security, during these fateful years, had already agreed with Russia that the

pledges of the Atlantic Charter were scraps of paper.

It is unthinkable that these Presidents and Secretaries of State could have been treasonable. That some of their advisors were treasonable has been proven. We now know about Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, Lee Pressman, Julian Henry Wadleigh and more than forty of the personnel of the IPR who penetrated the government and have been identified as Communists before Congressional Committees.

When Senator Joe McCarthy referred to various lists of 205, 81, and 57, he was guilty either of understatement or ignorance of the vast scope of the conspiracy within the Administration. Vice-President Barkley proudly declared that between 2500 and 3500 had been fired for questionable loyalty. Of the list of 81 cases, details of each of which were read on the floor of the Senate by Senator McCarthy, ten have since been fired or forced to resign from the government, though at the time they were all defended as paragons of virtue.

But none of these Communists would have had the slightest influence on national decisions if there had not been something lacking at the top. They might have stolen secrets, all the way from the pumpkin papers to the atom bomb, but they would not have been able to write national policy. Everytime they recommended a step in the wrong direction they were opposed by good Americans in important positions in the Government.

May I illustrate by just one instance:

On April 21, 1945, nine days after Harry S. Truman became President, a report was delivered by G2 (Army Intelligence) to the Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff, General George C. Marshall, for delivery to the President. It was signed by ten Colonels, all but two of whom are still alive.

The ninth item in the report of the ten Colonels stated:

"To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time—at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure, and honor in the future—and simultaneously destroy our ally China would be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce."

And lastly the report made a special recommendation, which I shall read in full:

"General MacArthur should be summoned to Washington immediately. The President should consider the all-important matter of Soviet Russia's entry into the Asiatic war with General MacArthur eye to eye. All other political and military personages should be excluded from this conference."

You will find this whole story on pages 2914 to 2917 of the MacArthur Hearings.

Our President did exactly the opposite of what the Colonels recommended. As a result, China was lost to the Free World.

Both stupidity and treason played a part—stupidity at the top and treason in the advisory level, but remember that we, the people of the United States, who are the real government, approved at the time.

We approved the enslavement of Eastern Europe, the betrayal of China, the withdrawal from Korea, and then the war there, the Alger Hiss, United Nations, and endless other acts against our own interest. Why?

From Ancient Greece comes the quotation: "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." Could this be the explanation? Is it possible that while each of us as an individual is perfectly sane, that collectively, as a nation, we have gone insane? All we need do is apply every day tests of sanity to our actions as a nation.

In 1948 General MacArthur said: "Anyone who proposes using American ground troops on the continent of Asia should have his reason examined." That is exactly what we did in Korea in 1950, and are still doing. Let's follow General MacArthur's advice and examine our reason.

Ten years ago we had become convinced that appeasement of aggressive Dictators was not only wrong, but it was useless. Since December, 1943, we have believed that appeasement of Stalin was the road to peace. Even the war in Korea has not disillusioned many of us. Were we sane then, or are we sane now?

The first week of the war in Korea, Chiang Kai-shek offered three of his eight American equipped divisions to fight in Korea. Secretary Acheson refused them. After the Chinese Communists intervened, Chiang reoffered those troops. Again we refused. Remember, those three divisions were more troops than all the rest of the U.N. put together. Stalin is using Chinese troops to fight for him. Do you think Stalin is crazy and we are sane, or vice-versa?

If Red China is admitted to the U.N., the anti-Communist Chinese armies under Chiang Kai-shek will become international outlaws; Russia will legally supply air force and navy to the Reds; and Formosa will fall. When that happens, the Philip-

pires and Indo-China will be outflanked and Japan may be untenable in case of war. Then, as General MacArthur wired the V.F.W. Convention in Chicago August 28, 1950, "It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American continents, our own home coast. . . ."

Yet on January 13, 1951 we voted in the U.N. for a peace offer to the Chinese Reds. It offered them a seat in the U.N. and the turn-over of Formosa. It is almost public knowledge that we are planning again for it after the election, if the peace talks with the Red Chinese murderers can be dragged out that long. In short, if General MacArthur knows what he is talking about, we are planning to shift the front line, if war comes, from the coast of Asia to the coast of California. What kind of sense does that make?

On December 12th last, Secretary Acheson expressed confidence that "when we became strong the Soviet Union would agree to talk peace and disarmament in good faith." Earlier last fall, President Truman said no agreement with the Soviets is worth the paper it is written on. We seem to believe them both.

Prior to the war in Korea, Chiang Kai-shek enforced a partial blockade of the China coast. Two days after the Korean war started, President Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet to stop that blockade, and the China coast was opened to more than a million tons of oil, cotton, tools, rubber, and all the needs of war. Only a protest by Senator O'Connor of Maryland partially stopped it. Yet, right today, American-owned ships are still carrying contraband to Red China, to help kill our sons in Korea. That is immoral as well as crazy. In fact, it

it symptomatic of one of the last stages of insanity—a suicidal mania.

Our whole attitude toward the war in Korea reeks of National madness. On January 29th President Truman said he has now awarded more Congressional Medals than any other President. Yet, a large section of American opinion, including the President and Secretary of State, do not seem to want us to win.

Twice before sizeable sections of American opinion did not favor victory. If the Tories' idea of compromise, instead of victory, had prevailed during the Revolution there would have been no United States. If the Copperheads call for compromise during the Civil War had prevailed, the United States, as we know it, would have ended.

When we were small, and still sane, we refused to pay blackmail to pirates saying: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Today we have paid tribute for Vogeler and for our four flyers to Hungary; tribute for Angus Ward, our Consul-General, and for the editor of the American paper in Shanghai, and for innumerable other Americans in China. Were we crazy one hundred fifty years ago or are we now?

In 1823 President Monroe refused Britain's offer to join us in the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine. We wanted to be free to act instead of just consult, even with only one other nation, and that nation the one that ruled the seas. One hundred twenty-two years after Monroe's proclamation we emasculated his Doctrine at Chapultepec and turned it into a consultative pact with twenty-one Latin American States. We had to do that because the U.N. Charter forbids us to act on our own and

we were so insistent on being sugar daddy to the U.N., we abandoned our freedom of action in this hemisphere without even a squawk.

In 1899 Secretary John Hay proclaimed the Open Door Policy, aimed immediately at preventing extension of Russian sovereignty in Manchuria, and permanently at preventing the trade and resources of China from falling into the grasp of any conquering military power. In 1922 at the nine Power Conference in Washington we sank part of our Navy to get Japan to agree to that same Open Door Policy. In 1941 we brought the attack on Pearl Harbor by refusing peace with Japan short of her withdrawal from China. Three years, two months and 1,350,000 casualties later, at Yalta, we secretly gave Russia what we had denied her in 1899 and Japan in 1941. And scarcely an American asks "Why the 1,350,000 casualties?"

On December 13th last, in his press conference, President Truman gave the reporters the low-down on the Korean war, strictly off the record. What he told them you and I don't know, but the reporters for the Russian Tass Agency and the New York Communist *Daily Worker* were there. Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not suggesting that President Truman is crazy. Just that we are.

From time to time we are told that the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Alliance, Greek-Turkish aid, rearming German divisions, and entry into the Korean war were calculated risks. And great successes. The calculations remain unexplained. The risk is clear. The success escapes us.

No policy has ever been outlined as a guide to our commitments. Everywhere we seem to be caught with too little, too late.

In 1949 our Secretary told us our policy was to "Let the dust settle." We withdrew from Korea in 1949 and rushed back unprepared in 1950. The dust has now settled on more than 20,000 American graves.

I hold in my hand a photostat of an article by George E. Sokolsky, dated January 24, 1951, in which he lists ninety-eight Americans who have been publicly fighting Communism since 1940. I have counted and find that I am personally acquainted with 71 of them. Some of them, I am happy to say, live or lived in Los Angeles. They include such men and women as Morrie Ryskind, Oliver Carlson, James W. Fifield, Jr., William R. Hearst, James McGuinness, Adolphe Menjou, Robert Montgomery, Roscoe Pound, Lela Rogers, Jack B. Tenney.

At various times in talks with some of them, I have been shocked to have them say that they felt that we were going to lose, partly from the inside and partly from the outside. Of course the Communists are all sincerely convinced of this, but to find some of the outstanding anti-Communists believing it, is a shock.

After the end of the war in Europe, our Supreme Commander ordered withdrawal from the areas we occupied in Thuringia, Saxony and Jachymov, the provinces containing the Erzgebirge pitchblende mines, source of uranium.

And yet today the majority of Americans, according to the Gallup Poll, think we'll be sunk if we don't elect as President next November, either the President who didn't know they were stealing the bomb, and that we were giving them the uranium mines, or the Supreme Commander who

didn't know what he was doing when he turned over those mines.

No wonder so many of the men listed by George Sokolsky think we are doomed.

On Monday, November 5th last, the N.Y. World Telegram carried the following two headlines:

"Gen. Ike to ask Arms, but Fast, for Europe."

On another page the headline read:

"Schuman says Acheson will present disarmament proposal to the U.N."

As Hamlet would say: "To Arm or not to Arm?"

As late as November 1951 we cannot seem to make up our minds. Maybe we are as mad as Hamlet.

We now know that all our military secrets were stolen—everything from the atom bomb to the newer anchored mine. In August 1950 I told the press that in 1945 Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada had given President Truman a list of one hundred fifty Americans connected with the Atom Spy Ring in Canada, and not one had been arrested. A day later, Lester Pearson, External Affairs Minister of Canada, said I was in error, that the list contained one hundred sixty-three names but they had no proof that they were atom spies. The names just came out of the memo books of the Canadian spies.

Scores of other spies have been named by Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, Hede Massing, Louis Budenz and others. Except for the six caught in the Fuchs atom spy ring, not one is in jail for such activity.

Meantime a man named Harry Bridges controls our shipping and has an absolute stranglehold on our last Pacific stronghold of Hawaii. It would be

difficult to explain to those fine Americans dying in Korea why it is so important to defeat the Communists there, while our homegrown variety control their lifeline, and are pampered here at home. The most charitable explanation is simply that we've gone stark, staring mad.

On November 17 last, the New York Herald Tribune, our leading Republican paper, referring to the release of the news of the slaughter of our POW's by the Reds in Korea, said:

"... it seems clear that an announcement of this kind should never have been made in this way, under the diplomatic situation obtaining, with this degree of irresponsibility. . . . That thousands of American lives have been sacrificed by Oriental Communist brutality is something we knew before; nothing can now bring them back . . . one can only hope that the net result will be to . . . promote rather than prevent a practicable end to this conflict."

In short, forget the murder of these loyal Americans and Koreans so as not to interfere with the shenanigans of the diplomats, of whose loyalty many of us have grave doubts. If the Herald Tribune represents America, I wonder if we deserve to survive?

This national madness that afflicts us is especially prevalent in our daily press and in all our organs of public opinion. We know that that is partly due to the infiltration of Reds and pinkoes. I am an optimist and believe we will eventually rout them out, though I see no signs of it now. But even if that is accomplished and we rid our press of the actual traitors, the madness that let them infiltrate will still afflict us.

Senators Herbert Lehman and Hubert Humphrey added the internment camp amendment to the McCarran Act, and I believe two of the former Japanese camps out here are being readied now. I think it would be wonderful to lock up all our leading intellectuals there, and give the rest of us dumb Americans a chance to do our own thinking in the quietude that would follow. Maybe we are not entirely hopeless cases.

In that quietude we would rediscover that Government is now, as always, the greatest infringer on natural rights, constitutional rights, legal rights and civil rights. We would become aware that dissenters and critics, and even crackpots, are not now, and never have been, seriously threatened with suppression by public opinion. We would realize that the agents of the Kremlin are not individual dissenters and critics, or even crackpots, but are ruthlessly disciplined members of a treasonable conspiracy that must be stamped out with equal ruthlessness.

Most of these examples of madness seem far away. Let's get closer to home. You have a great State University here, in spite of the fact that I contaminated it a long time ago, until I was shaken out at the end of my sophomore year by the earthquake of 1906. Or should I say, fire?

Two years ago the un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives published a two-volume report entitled "Hearings: Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory and Atomic Bomb Project at the University of California."

How shocking a story that is we'll all appreciate if and when the bombs drop on us. Not a single

one of those involved was arrested for his or her part, as far as I know.

That's past and it's difficult to get excited about the horse that's stolen. But what about the University now? I have no idea how many Communists it harbors, nor have the authorities, either, I suspect.

Bob Sproul is one of the most successful and one of the best liked university presidents in the country. And yet he was Chairman of the Institute of Pacific Relations during the very years of its heaviest Communist activity. Like Eisenhower at Columbia, he's personally anti-Communist. Is he not suffering from the same madness as the rest of us?

I don't know the situation out here, but this madness seems worse in our colleges back East than among the intellectually underprivileged like me, or even among the alumni of the very same institutions. In fact, the lefties operate a secret reign of terror on the campuses.

If any faculty member thinks General MacArthur is a great American, he must say so in a most circumspect manner. If he thinks Senator McCarthy has been of service to his country, he'd better not say so at all. And when it comes to such a low character as Alfred Kohlberg, even my best friends on college faculties dare not admit they know me. All in the name of "academic freedom."

Odd items that come to my attention lead me to believe that there is something rotten in the whole field of higher education. For example, the Council of Learned Societies is headed by a man who has been named under oath as a Communist. The Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations are

main supports of organizations now under investigation. A letterhead of "The American Scholar," the Phi Beta Kappa Quarterly, carries the names of five nationally known leftists among its editorial board of twelve and not one known as opposed to the lefties.

Two years ago when I was out here I learned that a resolution was pending before the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce proposing recognition of Red China. I was happy, later, to learn that it had been defeated in Committee.

When I learned of this resolution on November 8, 1949, I wrote the President of the San Francisco Chamber in protest. My last paragraph read:

"Our Government permitted the sale of oil, scrap iron, copper, machine tools and automotive equipment and airplane parts to Japan prior to Pearl Harbor. Young Americans died . . . in part as a result of these sales. We will repeat this tragic error if we build up Communist China, and Americans again of another generation will die . . . because of our stupidity."

I didn't know it would come true so soon. Let us for a moment consider that over-worked phrase: "Guilt by Association." When I was a boy out here we all knew that "Birds of a feather flock together." But now it's different. I suppose if collectors of taxes go to the races with gamblers, and stay free at Florida hotels with tax-evaders, and get mink coats wholesale, or for free, from dubious characters, we mustn't say anything about it. That would be guilt by association.

An all-time high for this nonsense was reached in the Readers Digest last month in an article by Stuart Chase, the genius who originally coined the

phrase, "The New Deal." Mr. Chase starts out referring to: "The heresy trial of Philip Jessup" and then says: "A clearer term would be guilt by verbal association." He then says:

"Communists are against Chiang Kai-shek; The State Department is dubious about Chiang; Therefore the State Department is run by Communists.

In essence, Senator McCarthy's whole case rests on this syllogism."

That does sound a bit ridiculous doesn't it? There's just one thing wrong with it. And that is that it is completely untrue, except for the statement that the State Department is run by the Reds.

What Senator McCarthy said about Philip Jessup was that he had belonged to or sponsored five Communist Fronts; that he had written a letter to the N.Y. Times in 1946 proposing we throw our stockpile of atom bombs in the ocean; that he had been Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Institute of Pacific Relations over a period of years; that he had been consulted on highest policy decisions by top Communists; that of his personal staff at I.P.R. the majority have been revealed in sworn testimony to be either Communists or espionage agents, and most of the rest as leftists. And that he and his State Department cronies have created disaster for us in the Pacific, out of the unconditional victory of 1945. Not a word about "The State Department is dubious about Chiang Kai-shek."

Maybe that's "guilt by association," but let's remember that Governor Dewey made his big reputation by convicting the members of Murder, Inc.,

a conspiracy to commit murder. Some turned State's evidence and the others burned in the electric chair at Sing Sing because of their association in the conspiracy. Guilt by association with a conspiracy in both cases.

Every day's papers carry items that exhibit our madness. Just a few:

Speaking at Asbury Park, New Jersey, December 8, last, Under-Secretary of the Army, Archibald Alexander, said:

"Aggression has been repelled in Korea in an action unique in history. It has been the greatest military victory the collective free world has ever achieved." May God save us from more such victories!

Or the Gallup Poll as reported December 19, 1951. The headline reads: "70% Favor Truman Meeting with Stalin." The same 70%, at least, know that no agreement, as President Truman said, would be worth the paper it was written on. They further know we would likely lose our shirts as well, as we did at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. Just another example of believing two contradictory statements at the same time. The clinical name for this is—schizophrenia.

A little sidelight on this Gallup poll result was that it appeared on page twenty of the World Telegram, but the Daily Worker carried it with glee in big type on page one. Maybe you think the Daily Worker is crazy?

Last December the U.N. General Assembly in Paris passed a Soviet resolution to investigate U.S. subversive activities behind the Iron Curtain (but not Soviet subversive activities). The U.S. Delegation voted for the Soviet Resolution. Do I think

that Senator Austin, Ambassador Jessup, Mrs. Roosevelt, Dr. Channing Tobias and the rest of our delegation were crazy? Of course not. I think we are.

Everybody knows that we will probably stumble into war with the Soviet Union eventually, or they'll pick their time to start it unless something intervenes. And most Americans realize that the only likely hope for something intervening is the overthrow of the Communist Dictatorship. Nearly everyone knows that there are fourteen members of the Soviet Politburo and they are the top dogs of the whole show.

But not many know that when Stalin made himself dictator in 1925, the Politburo consisted of seven members, of whom Stalin was one. The other six have all gone underground. Here's the roll call: Rykov, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin shot by Stalin. Tomsy committed suicide. Trotsky was assassinated in Mexico by an NKVD killer.

This, at least, suggests a road to peace; to the saving of millions of lives and untold misery. Because that road doesn't lead through the U.N., we reject it. Senator Taft suggests it in his recent book, "A Foreign Policy for Americans." Unfortunately it wouldn't be so expensive in lives or money, and sanity recommends it, so we reject the thought.

After Harry Truman became president he ordered a study of how our post-war policy was arrived at. It was published by the State Department in February 1950. It contains seven hundred twenty-six pages. But it does not reveal what our post-war policy was, if any. What it does reveal is that on February 12, 1942, the "Advisory Com-

mittee on Post-War Foreign Policy" was set up, and continued to study and recommend all through the war. On page seventy-nine it says . . . the Committee's existence and work were kept secret."

Who were these secret double-domes that made up this Committee, its sub-committees and staffs? Among them were Henry Agard Wallace, Paul H. Appleby, Alger Hiss, Philip C. Jessup, Nelson A. Rockefeller, *Harry Dexter White*, David K. Niles, *Leland Olds*, Harry Hopkins, *Lauchlin Currie*, *Archibald MacLeish*, Claude Pepper, *Julian Henry Wadleigh*, Dorothy Fosdick, Ralph J. Bunche, Wayne Coy, Frances Perkins, Isador Lubin, Arthur J. Altmeyer, Charles E. Wilson, Harold L. Ickes, James Lawrence Fly, Dean G. Acheson, Clark H. Eichelberg, *Lawrence Duggan*, General Geo. C. Marshall, *Esther C. Brunauer*, and Benjamin V. Cohen. In addition a number of Senators and Congressmen served on this Committee. Some of the persons I have named are very estimable persons, though none—not one—has a record of having guessed right on our relations with the Soviets. Some of the persons named have now been revealed as Soviet agents.

Remember this was all secret until February 1950. The book partly reveals and partly conceals what was cooked up.

Our present-generation Democrats seem to have forgotten Woodrow Wilson who said:

"We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more . . . Honesty and competence need no shield of secrecy."

Is it any wonder that some of us, as we catch glimpses through what Woodrow Wilson calls the "shield of secrecy," see the hand of Moscow more

and more clearly? And is it not truly National Madness that permitted and still permits this?

Here we are in the thirty-fifth year of an undeclared war being waged on us by World Communism. You and I may not have recognized that fact until lately, but Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, reported that fact officially and publicly to the Congress on October 27, 1949, in a lengthy report. He summed it up in a few words, which I quote:

" . . . the purpose of the Bolsheviks is to subvert the existing principles of government and society the world over, including those countries in which democratic principles are already established. They have built up a political machine which, by the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the ruthlessness of its methods, suggest the Asiatic despotism of the early Tsars."

What should we do? Why not consider a suggestion from Stalin.

As part of President Roosevelt's recognition of the Soviet Union, she agreed to discontinue all subversive activity here. Of course Russia did not observe this pledge, so our Ambassador to Moscow, Wm. C. Bullitt, was instructed to complain to Stalin. Stalin is reported to have said: "Why don't you shoot them?" I suppose it didn't occur to him that we were so crazy that we had no laws to protect ourselves against this most deadly peril.

Two years ago, my Congressman, Ralph W. Gwinn, introduced a Resolution in the Congress reading:

"Resolved, That the Communist International, the Comintern, the Cominform, and all their sections, branches, affiliates, organizations, subsidiaries, and

agents are hereby declared to be the enemies of the United States, within the meaning of Article III, Section 3, of the Constitution of the United States."

That would make legal the fact that World Communism is our enemy, and would provide the death penalty for acts (not thoughts) in its service. Congressman Gwinn's resolution would just provide the legal basis for carrying out Stalin's suggestion.

But we prefer to send innocent and loyal and patriotic Americans to be shot in Korea, while protecting the traitors at home. That is not soft-heartedness—that is insanity.

We know that the men who head our Government are not the best men in the United States to direct our fight on Communism. We know we have the best industrial plant and know-how in the world, yet we discover Russia has given her stooges in Korea, from Russian surplus, better tanks and better and more jet planes than we can give our own sons. We cannot seem to see the connection.

We know that nearly everywhere in the world events have turned out badly for us. We know that there is a vast conspiracy in our midst directed by our deadly enemy. It has been proven in court, and before Congressional Committees that that conspiracy has penetrated the heart of our Government, our press, our movies, our atomic secrets.

We know that Alger Hiss, the man who sat behind President Roosevelt's chair at Yalta, was a single member of that conspiracy. We know that

two of the friends who testified for him sit on our Supreme Court; that one who publicly declared his undying friendship is our Secretary of State; that another who testified for him is our Ambassador to the U.N.; that another was a former Secretary of War, and that the President called the charges against him a "red herring." And we know that every one of these men had access, as you and I do not, to the information of the F.B.I., the very information that convicted Hiss in open court. This is just one case of hundreds that have now been exposed.

And yet we cannot seem to put two and two together and get the answer. If our reason were unimpaired, we would realize that the men who have led us from victory to disaster are either cogs in that conspiracy, or its dupes, or, like us, somewhat insane. And with one voice we would demand a clean-up of personnel and a change of policy. Such a policy must be publicly proclaimed so that we and all the world may know that the secret deals, the betrayals, and the confusions of the past will be reversed. The clean-up of personnel must also be public, else how can we be sure it is done?

Before we can have a world policy, we must know the objectives we want that policy to accomplish. President Truman says our objective is "Peace." By peace he means 100,000 casualties, \$54 billion for arms and \$10½ billion for foreign aid, per annum; continuing forever, while one-third of the world rots behind the Iron Curtain. May I suggest that even without conscious thought about it, most Americans would agree that our real objective is not Peace, as President Truman

suggests, but a world of Freedom and Justice under Law.

To bring about such a world, may I propose the following six-point policy.

First, of course, clean up the Soviet Fifth Column here. Clean it up completely and ruthlessly, without interfering with unconnected dissenters, critics and crackpots.

Second, accept as allies only those nations which have the courage to choose our side openly by taking the same measures against their own Fifth Column. Otherwise, as we now see in Iran and Egypt, a change of Government, or even just of slogans, puts them on the other side, strengthened with the economic and military aid we have given them.

Third, cancel all diplomatic and trade relations with the Soviet bloc; and insist our allies do the same. Permit no economic, military or charitable aid to any nations except our new allies.

Fourth, fire the U.N. out of the U.S. and set up a new group, organized for justice under law, comprised only of our allies. The laws to be binding on all the world as fast as we can get them accepted.

Fifth, within the limits of our ability, aid every nation and every force fighting the Kremlin, both outside and inside the Iron Curtain, countersubversion to meet Communist subversion.

Sixth, publicly repent our betrayals, our timidities, and our stupidities. Only then can the world trust us and we each other.

On October 17th, in Miami, General MacArthur charged that our objective in Korea was to get Red China into the U.N. and turn over Formosa.

The President called his statement untrue. General MacArthur then challenged the President to state "that under no conditions . . . would the U.S. permit Formosa to fall into Red hands, or Communist China to be seated in the U.N." The President remained silent.

You've all heard of Presidential nominations made by deals in smoke-filled rooms. Back in July 1944, Senator Harry S. Truman walked into such a room—a penthouse in the Stevens Hotel in Chicago. There he made a deal with Sidney Hillman—remember, "Clear it with Sidney." With Mr. Hillman were Nathan Witt, John Abt, Lee Pressman and C. B. Baldwin—all Communists and three of them since identified as espionage agents. If you had an employee who went to make a deal with such a gang you would certainly want to know why; and what was the deal. Well, Harry Truman is your employee. On your behalf, in August 1950, I asked the President exactly those questions. Again he remained silent.

Ladies and gentlemen: In a world of chaos and evil the great American public has been emulating the three Japanese monkeys. Remember the little brass figures? With the words "See no evil. Hear no evil. Speak no evil."

It is time to open our eyes and ears, and speak out.

To secure additional single copies, or in quantity, please address

FREEDOM CLUB
FIRST CONGRESSIONAL CHURCH
535 South Hoover Street Los Angeles 5, California
PRICE 25 CENTS